PATENT
Docket No. GB920030063US1

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant:	Stephen James Todd	)
Serial No.:	10560203	)
Filed:	December 8, 2005	)
For:	Method, Apparatus, and Computer Program Product For	) Group Art
	Processing a Queue of Messages	) Unit: 2191
		)
Examiner:	Matthew J. Brophy	)

INTERVIEW AGENDA

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Examiner:

This paper is in response to a planned telephone interview at the examiner's convenience and in response to the Office Action mailed on March 3rd, 2008. In the interview, Applicants would like to discuss the following arguments and amendments in view of the prior art. Applicants are interested in working with the examiner to find a suitable amendment that will place this application in condition for allowance.

-1-

Proposed Amendments to the Claims:

1. (Currently Amended) A method for processing a queue of messages, each message

   representing at least one request for an update to a database, the method comprising:

   browsing a messages of a work queue for an update request, the update request queued at

   least a predetermined number of messages ahead of a currently executing work

   queue, the work queue comprising a combination of update requests and database

   requests received for a database management system (DBMS);

   identifying extracting from a browsed message an the update request; and

   sending a pretend update request to the a database management system (DBMS)

   responsible for the database which is to be updated, the pretend update request

   derived from the update request, the pretend update request comprising an

   indication that directs the DBMS to not execute an the update operation request,

   but instead to prefetch data that will be required when a corresponding real the

   update request is processed requested.

2. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 1, wherein the method comprises translating the

   pretend update request into a prefetch request and reading the prefetching required data.

6. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 2 wherein the prefetch request has a

   predetermined form comprising at least an identifier and the method further comprises:

   retaining the predetermined form of the prefetch request;

   associating an the identifier with the retained predetermined form in order that the

   predetermined form can be identified and used in subsequent performance

   of the real update request, such that retained predetermined form is used

   by the DBMS in place of parsing the real update request; and

returning the identifier in response to the pretend update request.

9. (Currently Amended) A computer program product comprising a computer readable

storage medium having computer usable program code for pre-processing at a database

management system (DBMS) of update requests to a database controlled by the DBMS,

the computer program product comprising:

computer usable program code for receiving an update request at the DBMS, the

update request derived from messages of a work queue, the update request

queued at least a predetermined number of messages ahead of a currently

executing work queue message, the work queue comprising a combination

of update requests and database requests for the DBMS;

computer usable program code for receiving an indication at the DBMS indicating

that the update request is a pretend update request that directs the DBMS

to not execute an update request but instead to ~~prefetch~~ read data for the

update request, the pretend update request derived from the update

request;

computer usable program code for translating the pretend update request into a

prefetch request; and

computer usable program code for ~~prefetching~~ reading required data based on the

prefetch request.

10. (Currently Amended) The ~~method~~ computer program product of claim 9 further comprising

receiving a real update request at the DBMS and executing the real update request using

~~previously prefetched~~ data previously read for the update request.

11. (Currently Amended) The ~~method~~ computer program product of claim 9 wherein the

-3-

prefetch request has a predetermined form and the ~~method~~<ins>computer program product</ins> further comprises:

retaining the predetermined form of the prefetch request;

associating the identifier with the retained predetermined form in order that the predetermined form can be identified and used in subsequent performance of the real update request; and

returning the identifier in response to the pretend update request.

12. (Currently Amended) The ~~method~~ <ins>computer program product</ins> of claim 11 further comprising receiving the identifier with a real update request, and using the predetermined form associated with the identifier in performance of the real update request.

13. (Currently Amended) The ~~method~~ <ins>computer program product</ins> of claim 9 further comprising informing a memory manager that the ~~prefetehed~~ data <ins>from the read request</ins> may be discarded from memory subsequent to ~~the~~ <ins>using of the data from the read in</ins> ~~use of the prefetched data in the~~ processing of a real update request.

-4-

Agenda Item # 1. Claims 1-3, 6-15 and 18-20 are rejected user 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent 5,205,289 Palmer here hereinafter Palmer.
Claim #1.

        1.   Palmer seems to teach predictive caching using an external unique identifier (UID) for objects. In contrast, the claimed invention teaches reading ahead in a message queue that includes both update requests and read requests and uses the pending update requests to load the data that will be needed when the update request becomes the currently active work queue message.

        2.   Palmer fails to teach pretend update requests and in particular pretend update requests derived from a queued update request.

        3.   Palmer seems to teach prefetching data, based on historical data, e.g. objects are prefetched based on the data has already been read. Palmer seems to teach pattern matching, and analysis to determine what objects should be prefetched next. Palmer seems to teach a predictive cache based on the history of the data. Amended Claim 1 recites retrieving data for an update request that is queued but is just not yet the currently active work queue message. Claim 1 is distinct from Palmer because Claim 1 recites use of a queued update request instead of predictive pattern matching analysis of historical requests in anticipation of an update request not yet received.

Agenda Item #2. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because a copy of the WIPO publication has been submitted. An abstract on a separate sheet of paper will be submitted. Figures will be correctly labeled: FIG.1, FIG. 2, FIG. 3, Figure 1 will be labeled "Prior Art". Each sheet will be relabeled as "Replacement Sheet" in the top margin.

Agenda Item # 3. A logic unit stored on a computer readable medium is statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101, 35 U.S.C. §112, 1st and 2nd para..

Applicants agree with the Examiner that the term "computer readable medium" is not recited word-for-word in the specification and, Applicants have proposed a change in the amendments above. Applicants propose changing "computer readable medium" to "computer readable storage medium" and believe the proposed change place Claims 9 & 14 in condition for allowance. Applicants seek the opinion of the Examiner with regard to the proposed amendments. Further claims 10-13 depend directly on indirectly on claim 9. Applicants believe that since claims 9 & 14 as amended are in condition for allowance that also applies to claims 9 & 14 as amended are now in condition for allowance that this also applies to claims 10-13 and claims 15-18, and seek the opinion of the Examiner with regard to the proposed amendments.

Respectfully submitted,
Date:_ May 15, 2008 _   _/David J. McKenzie/___

Kunzler & McKenzie   David J. McKenzie
8 E. Broadway, Suite 600   Reg. No. 46,919
Salt Lake City, Utah 8410   Attorney for Applicant
Telephone: 801/994-4646